RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 19 2007

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig.1 and Fig. 7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1/6 and 5/6.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 19 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 remain pending in the application.

The drawings are objected to for informalities as noted in the office action. In response, "Replacement Sheets" for Figs. 1 and 7 are being submitted concurrently herewith and therefore the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention. Erhage (US Patent 6,127,966). In response claim 1 has been amended and is believed to be patentable over Erhage for the reasons as discussed below.

Claim 1 has been amended and specifically requires at least two separate calibration steps:

A first step during which a calibration circuit (which is used to measure the phase and amplitude of the signal U_m through the source to be calibrated) is closed,

A second step during which the calibration circuit is opened at the source to be calibrated (which is used to perform a relative measurement U_f of the microwave interference signal coming from the imperfect electromagnetic isolation of the calibration circuit and not coming from outside).

Step 1 closes the calibration circuit at the source to be calibrated and opens the calibration circuit at all other sources. Step 2 opens the calibration circuit at all sources without any exception. Both steps are required to fulfill one aim of the invention, which is to improve the calibration by correcting for the microwave interference (see page 1, lines 32-35, of reference 1). Erhage only discloses step 1 (the source to be calibrated is commanded to its reference mode whether in reception or transmission mode, while the others are commanded to their isolated modes). The rejection of claim 1 is not justified because Erhage does not disclose the necessary step 2.

Regarding claim 2, as an extension of claim 1, specifically denies a method of correction that requires a measurement of U_f. The rejection of claim 2 is not proper because in Erhage does not provide the relative measurement U_f.

Regarding claim 3, as an extension to claim 1 and claim 5, as an extension to claim 2, specifically define a method of amplitude calculation that requires knowledge of the relative measurement U_f. The rejection of claim 3 and 5 is not proper because in Erhage does not provide the relative measurement U_f.

Regarding claim 4, as an extension of claim 2, specifically defines a method of calculation of a complex term α, which is used to correct the fluctuations over time of a relative measurement U_F. The rejection of claim 4 is not proper because in Erhage does not provide the relative measurement U_f.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 23, 2007
KMB/lhb